DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 506 FL 019 958

AUTHOR Freeman, Donald
TITLE Language Teacher Education, Emerging Discourse, and Change in Classroom Practice.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at an International Congress on Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching (1st, Hong Kong, April 1991).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Language Teachers; Second Language Instruction; *Socialization; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Role; Teaching Methods; *Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

A discussion of teacher education for second-language teachers argues that this training has generally been based on two misguided premises: that teaching is the execution of activity in classrooms; and that it involves shaping that activity to reflect some broadly held perceptions of effective classroom pedagogy. Two alternatives are proposed: that teaching involves both thinking and doing; and that the effects of teacher education lie less in influencing how teachers behave than in recasting how they think about what they do in classrooms. The discussion integrates two elements: an 18-month research project on the influences of teacher education on teachers' understandings of their teaching; and a conceptual argument that extends those findings to raise larger questions about the nature and processes of second language teacher education. It is organized around six statements that build an argument for a different view of teacher education, one based on the conceptualization of socialization into professional discourse. (38 references) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald Freeman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Language teacher education, emerging discourse, and change in classroom practice

Donald Freeman
School for International Training

Plenary address given at
The First International Conference on Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching
City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
April, 1991

ED345506

Introduction:

In this paper, I want to argue that the education of second language teachers has generally been based on two misguided premises. The first is that teaching is the execution of activity, that it involves doing things in classrooms. The second, which follows from the first, is that teacher education involves shaping that activity to reflect some broadly held perceptions of effective classroom pedagogy. These premises are critical to any examination of the efficacy of second language teacher education; in this paper I want to counter them with two alternatives. The first is that teaching involves both thinking and doing; the second is that the effects of teacher education lie less in influencing how teachers behave, than in recasting how they think about what they do in classrooms.

This paper weaves together two strands: one is an account of a eighteen-month research project on the influences of teacher education on teachers' understandings of their teaching [Freeman 1991] and the other is a conceptual argument which extends those findings to raise larger questions about the nature and processes of second language teacher education. The paper is organized around six statements which build a conceptual argument for a different view of teacher education. The aim is to reexamine the central operating premises of teacher education in second language teaching and to propose an alternative view, based on the concept of socialization into professional discourse, of what is happening as teachers learn to teach.

#1. Teaching is the integration of thought and action

Over the past decade, an increasing body of research has challenged the accepted notion that teaching is simply the exercise of classroom activity

FL 019958

2
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[Freeman 1990a; Clark & Peterson 1986; Shavelson & Stern 1983]. The broad process-product paradigm which tended to dominate educational research generally [Dunkin & Biddle 1974], and research in second language classrooms specifically [Chaudron 1988], cannot adequately account for the complex and contingent nature of classroom interaction or for the role of the teacher within those interactions. In place of the process-product orientation, an alternative cognitive paradigm has developed [Kagan 1988; Shulman 1986], which holds that classrooms have, for participants, an interior, mental landscape which is as crucial to understanding them as any study of their external behavioral manifestations. In this paradigm, the teacher is seen to have a "mental life" [Walberg 1977; NIE 1975] which influences and directs what happens in the classroom. Likewise students' perceptions and assumptions about the nature of classrooms and of learning are critical to the negotiation of pedagogical activity [Allwright 1988, 1984].

Within this general cognitive framework, teaching is seen as more than the exercise of specific ways of acting in classroom settings; it involves both action and the thinking which underlies and directs it. This new-found complexity affects the view of teacher education as well. When teaching is seen primarily as a set of processes, the efficacy of which are judged by the learning outcomes which they produce, teacher education is defined as inculcating these forms of effective action in teachers. However when teaching is seen as ways of acting and thinking, teacher education becomes more than learning to implement specific ways of doing things in classrooms; it involves the construction of teachers' views of teaching. As Richards and Nunan [1990, xii] note in their introduction to a recent collection of papers on second language teacher education, there is "a recognition that effective teaching involves higher level cognitive processes, which cannot be taught [through teacher education] directly."

An example may be helpful here. Often when a teacher puts into practice a complex procedure in the classroom-- a communicative activity or process-writing conferences for example-- the activity seem to become flat and routine. To a teacher educator or supervisor who may be observing the endeavor, it can seem like the teacher has either misundertood the complexity of the activity or is resisting its proper implementation. These

are, however, essentially behavior-based explanations. Because the observers can only see what is happening, and have little overt access to the thinking which underlies it, they are often lead to adopt a perspective of remediation: to consider how they can help the teacher to improve what he or she is doing [Freeman 1990b].

If, however, teaching is seen as the integration of thought and action, these same observers may be come to a different conclusion, namely that the teacher's flat and routinized implementation of the complex procedure represents a partially developed conception of that teaching practice. Just as a language learner's output goes through formal and conceptual stages en route to mastery, so too may a teacher's understanding of practice evolve over time as understanding moves between the cognitive to the behavioral realms.[1] When teaching is seen as having a cognitive dimension, certain apparent paradoxes-- such as teacher resistance in this example-- can be accounted for. However, teacher education also becomes more complicated. Clearly teachers' "mental lives" do not begin when they enter teacher education programs; rather they must bring this formal training a background of tacit knowledge and personal theories about classrooms and what goes on in them.

#2. People come into teacher education programs with deeply held conceptions of teaching and learning.

The question is: where do these conceptions come from? Probably the clearest source for teachers' understandings of teaching and learning is their experience as students, what Lortie [1975] has called their "apprenticeship of observation." A recent report from the U.S. National Center for Research on Teacher Education, (NCRTE), [Kennedy 1990] lays out the stark mathematics of this apprenticeship:

> By the time we receive our bachelor's degree,[2] we have observed teachers and participated in their work for up to 3060 days. In contrast, teacher preparation programs [at the Masters level] usually require

---

1 Freeman [1990c] is a discussion fo this point from the perspective of the development of a teacher's professional life.

2 Although Kennedy refers to those studying to be teachers in the United States, I doubt that the basic 40:1 ratio differs very much across educational systems in various countries.

> [about] 75 days of classroom experience. What could possibly happen during these 75 days to significantly alter the practices learned during the preceding 3060 days? [Kennedy 1990, 4]

The teachers in the longitudinal study which I have done [Freeman 1991], report definite-- if uncomplimentary memories-- of their "apprenticeship of observation." One recalls her foreign language classes in high school as:

> [i][3] Passing notes and [being] totally bored. Just having fun with my friends. I don't remember what I learned in high school; I think we did a lot of work [in books] with blanks... just filling in blanks and memorizing conjugations.
> [AT: I: 6/27/89]

These memories are more than a backdrop for formal teacher education however; they equip teachers with explanations of classroom practice. The memories of instruction gained through their "apprenticeship of observation" function as de facto guides for teachers as they approach what they do in the classroom. As another teacher in the study puts it:

> [ii] It seemed like the only way to do it [teach Spanish]. That's the way I had gone from seventh grade all the way through college and, you know, that was normal. And I had learned that way and there I was teaching Spanish, and these kids would do the same thing .
> [CB: GI: 8/17/90]

It would, however, be a somewhat dismal position to argue that teachers simply replicate the oftentimes negative and ineffective instruction which they recall having received. Such an interpretation of these findings [Kennedy 1990; Freeman 1991] would put a heavily determinist spin on the complexity which the cognitive paradigm is intended to engender in such research. So it is important to recognize that even as teachers fall back on the explanations of practice which derive from their experience as students, they are generally dissatisfied with those explanations. They often acknowledge them as inadequate and want to go beyond them:

> [iii] I had had sort of a rotten [foreign] language experience in high school. I didn't like it; it was a bore, and I didn't get anything out of it. Then I lived abroad and loved languages and I thought, 'Well, can't we put these two together somehow.' I thought so many people-- such as myself-- had such a disservice in the classroom-- not being able to enjoy

---

3 The notation in lower case letters refers to data from Freeman [1991].

languages-- so I think I wanted to be a language teacher and hopefully try to bring out the parts that I like about languages and communicate that to my students.
[AT: I: 6/27/89]

The urge to change and pull to do what is familiar creates a central tension in teachers' thinking about their practice. The understanding of teaching gained through what I have called these norms of experience [Freeman 1991] is quite powerful; as Kennedy [1990] says of the NCRTE studies, the "apprenticeship of observation" creates "indelible imprints of teaching." One teacher expresses the norms of experience this way:

[iv] I found myself falling into the pattern of the way I was taught languages back in the 'seventies. I thought it was boring [then] so why wouldn't they [students] think it's boring [now]. Just because I'm dancing in front of the room is not going to make it any better for them. It's still the same method."
[AT: I: 3/21/90]

Acknowledging that teachers enter preparation or in-service programs with deeply held conceptions of practice is more than simply a recognition of their a priori understandings of classroom practice. It is important in two crucial ways. First it confirms the functional requirement that such programs address what teachers know by virtue of their experience, rather than treating them as tabula rasa, ready to receive any input as new and initial to their understanding of teaching and learning. Second, it leads to a crucial-- if uncomfortable-- realization, namely that teacher education is a weak form of intervention. In the greater scheme of their professional lives, formal education in teaching probably has only a minimal impact on what teachers' do in the classroom.[4] As those involved in teacher education, we can take this realization as an indication of our ineffectiveness or as a challenge to rethink what we do and how we do it.

I prefer to take the latter course. Where, then, do we start in rethinking teacher education? It seems to me that the first two points in this paper offer a useful point of departure:

---

[4] I want to thank Dr. Barbara Neufeld, of Harvard University and the [U.S.] National Center for Research on Teacher Education, for conversations which have helped me to clarify this point.

First, that teacher education has to deal with teachers' conceptions of teaching, how they think about and carry out what they do in classrooms.

Second, that teacher education must examine how these conceptions are put together and how they can be influenced or developed.

#3: Teacher education can-- given certain structural features and processes-- influence teachers' understandings by helping them to articulate their given explanations for what they do.

This position has been persuasively argued by Shulman, a leading researcher in the cognitive paradigm [Shulman 1987, 1986], who makes the following case for it:

> While tacit knowledge may be characteristic of many things that teachers do, our obligation as teacher educators must be *to make the tacit explicit*. [emphasis added] Teachers will become better educators when they can begin to have explicit answers for the questions, 'How do I know what I know? How do I know the reasons for what I do? Why do I ask my students to perform or think in particular ways?' The capacity to answer such questions not only lies at the heart of what we mean by becoming skilled as a teacher; it also requires a combining of reflection on practical experience and reflection on theoretical understanding. [Shulman 1988, 33]

The question then becomes how, in practice, do we 'make the tacit explicit' in teacher education? The study, which I have refered to in this paper, offers the beginnings of a response to that question. It was an longitudinal qualitative examination of the development of four teachers' conceptions of practice as they took part in a teacher education program. It was designed in five phases to follow the contour of the program, the summer MAT Program at the School for International Training.

<< insert figure #1 here >>

Since those who matriculate into that summer MAT program are required to have a minimum of three years' experience in language teaching and a fulltime position to which they will return during the Interim Year, the program is essentially an in-service one. This helped to neutralize the issue of how entering a new teaching environment after the education program might shape teachers' practice, an issue which is present in the research on pre-service teacher education programs [Etheridge 1988; Crow 1986]. Thus this

FIGURE #1

A Summary of the Phases, Data, and Structure of the Study

[Freeman 1991]

Dates	Phase	Data[5]	In-service Program
Spring 1989	Pre-Program	Interviews; observations	(Prior to matriculation, in home school)
Summer 1989	**Summer #1**	Interviews; document analysis of written work	First summer of course work
School year 1989-1990	**Interim Year**	Interviews; observations; document analysis	Interim Year on-the-job practicum teaching at home school
Summer 1990	**Summer #2**	Interviews; document analysis of written work	Second summer of course work
Fall 1990	Post-Program	Interviews; observations	Completed course work; thesis preparation

Key: The phases (in bold), set off by lines above, are the three major components of the summer MAT sequence. A thesis, written after the second summer, completes the degree requirements.

---

[5] The data in the study were gathered in semi open-ended interviews, document analysis focusing on their written work for the in-service program, and observations of their teaching at their home schools. The analysis involved open coding and matrix displays; data reduction was through the analysis of themes and concepts. The study resulted in intensive case studies of each of the four teachers and an extensive comparison and development of cross-case findings.

study could focus on how participation in the teacher education program itself helped the teachers to "make the tacit explicit" since their teaching environment was held more-or-less constant (see Table #1, column 4).

#4. The process of articulation--making the tacit explicit-- brings into play new discourse and with it, different ways of conceptualizing teaching.

Like any community, a teacher education program shares-- to a greater or lesser degree-- a common discourse. Such discourses are, as sociolinguist James Gee observes, "...ways of being in the world, or forms of life which integrate words, acts, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities." So a discourse functions as "a sort of 'identity kit' which comes complete with [ways] to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular social role that others will recognize." [Gee 1990, 142]. The discourse creates a set of facts which are socially constructed; they are perceptions which accepted as givens by members of the discourse community [Fleck 1935/ 1979]. In the discourse of second language teaching for example, we talk about language learning in terms of 'the affective filter' or 'interlanguage,' or about teaching in terms of 'techniques' and 'lesson plans,' or the content of lessons as 'the present perfect' or 'ordering in a restaurant.' These ideas become the socially constructed facts on which the shared professional discourse of second language teacher education is based.

Encountering and mastering the professional discourse-- the ways in which teaching and learning are talked about by the teacher education community-- plays a central role in the process of making the tacit explicit. Teachers are thus able to articulate, and to expose, their tacitly held conceptions of practice. Working from the data of this study, Cazden and I have suggested that these encounters with the new professional discourse serve two important purposes [Freeman & Cazden 1991]. One is a social/ referential function which allows the teachers to make themselves part of the discourse community as they use it. The other is a cognitive function, which enables them to identify aspects of their experience and thus to organize and to develop their conceptions of teaching.

Reflecting on her experience over the two summers of the in-service program, one teacher in the study is quite explicit about these twin functions.

She refers to the discourse as "jargon," indicating perhaps its distance from her other discourses, or forms of identity [Gee 1990]:

> **[v]** A lot of people [fellow trainees] have problems with jargon. They think there has been too much of it this summer and that there's labels for everything... I like it. Just because it has been introduced doesn't mean I have to use it; it doesn't mean I agree with it. But [A]at least if there's a word associated to what I'm thinking about, it makes me feel good because I know it means I'm not the only one. <...>[6] [B]It helps organize things. <...> It helps with my thinking process <...> It helps me as a teacher... be organized and have something to fall back on. [CB: I: 8/20/90]

Here the social/ referential function (A) is clearly expressed along side its cognitive counterpart (B). Together they allow the teacher a new way of conceptualizing what she does in the classroom as well as an identity as a member of a community which thinks of teaching in this way.

The cognitive function of the shared discourse develops through three broad phases. These phases reflect the interaction of the structural features of the particular teacher education program with the participants' constructions of new understandings of teaching. I have refered to the three phases as: **naming, applying,** and **reconceiving**.

In the process of **naming**, which takes places primarily in the first summer of the in-service program (see Table #1), the teachers perceive their previous classroom experience through the shared vocabulary of social facts of the teacher education community.[7] In one instance, a teacher talks about how in writing a paper she was able to name a private concept, which she called the 'comfort zone,' in shared terms.

> **[vi]** [L]ast night was the first paper I wrote that I thought I discovered anything. I've done three, and up until now I keep talking about this strange thing called 'the comfort zone.' I didn't know what it was; it was just a feeling that I was looking for. <..> I realized that the security or comfort for me as a student would mean the technique would have

---

6 The three dots in pointed brackets, <...>, indicate that the passage has been edited; three dots alone indicate a pause in speech.

7 Peirce [1990] discusses 'naming' as a political act of discourse, and offers an interesting example-- in an ESL classroom-- in which one set of names compete with others to assign meaning and thus relative importance to an event.

to allow for student initiative. For me, **[A]student initiative creates security if it's given slowly.** I just realized that's what **[B]I was talking about: I was looking for 'initiative' and didn't know the word [for it].** [CB: I: 7/28/89]

Naming in the shared discourse is a process of recognizing what is tacit, (B), and voicing it in shared terms, (A). In this case, the teacher draws indirectly on Stevick's discussion of teacher control and student initiative [1980, 17-20] which had been introduced some weeks earlier in her course work. It is significant to the acquisition to the discourse that she appears to be unaware of where the professional terms originated; in fact, it is important that they now feel like her own terms. But it is also important to recognize that her use of them may not mean that the terms have been fully understood. To the users of the discourse, the faculty and others more versed in it, the naming sounds fluent. However to the teacher-learner,[8] it may feel only partially right and contextually appropriate.

In acquiring the professional discourse, **questioning**, the second phase occurs during the Interim Year practicum (see Table #1) when the teachers return to their familiar school environments to teach. Questions about teaching, posed in the familiar setting of the home school, force them to rethink teacher and student roles. The questions are posed in the shared discourse; which, in turn, triggers the use of the new discourse for explanations in response. One teacher talks about the process:

[vii] I'm asking myself more in-depth questions this year. It doesn't always have the results I desire, but at least I'm asking myself those questions and I'm not constantly looking for ways to change, modify, improve. It never would have occured to me to ask myself the question, 'What am I doing that students could be doing?' My feeling was: 'OK I'm the teacher and they take orders from me.' [JG: I: 3/28/90]

Questioning seems to be process of cognitive reorganization; it results in rethinking existing practice and not necessarily, as the teacher says, in

---

8 Kennedy [1991] uses this term in place of the usual 'teachers-in-training' or 'trainees,' to emphasize that teaching is not simply trained and internalized, but must be learned. Similarly, the name of the [U.S.] National Center for Research on Teacher Education has been changed, in the latest funding cycle, to the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

"looking for ways to change, modify, [or] improve." It does so through a process of contrast, in which the teacher's de facto, local language explanations are set against those in the new professional discourse. This competition and co-existence of explanations for practice is a crucial point to which I will return.

The process of naming aspects of experience, within the context of the discourse community during the first summer, and then applying those new terms to classroom practice in the home school, during the Interim Year, builds a fuller sense of the new discourse. This leads to what I have called **reconceiving**, a process by which the teachers rethink their current and previous practice using the new discourse. In one course paper, a teacher reconceives a reading lesson which she had taught the two years earlier.

> **[viii]** I had a student who provided very informative feedback as I was explaining the background around some more difficult Spanish: "How could we have known that?" [the student asked]. I responded, "You couldn't have. But I didn't expect you to." To which she replied, "I didn't know I was supposed to know that." In other words, her **schema for that reading level** didn't exist. She didn't know enough about the vocabulary, the form of writing, or the dialects of Spanish to distinguish the language as unique. Apart from that, she had been **reading at a Stage 1 level**[9] with the text. She was **decoding words** so intensely that she had **missed all the meaning. This bottom-up approach** is characterized in the saying 'she couldn't see the forest for the trees.'
> [AT: P: 7/10/90]

Drawing on the professional discourse of second language reading, highlighted in bold, which she is encountering in a course on Teaching and Learning the Written Language during the second summer of the in-service program (see Table #1), she provides a new explanation for what happened in the lesson. The locus of her understanding of the student's response to the assignment thus shifts from the issue of management and discipline to one of relative skills in second language reading.

As the new discourse develops, it does not do so in a vacuum however. The teachers must understand it in relation to-- and ultimately incorporate it into-- their existing and on-going conceptions of practice. So

---

9 The teacher is refering to Chall's [1983] stages of reading development.

they have at their disposal two or more ways of conceptualizing their teaching. These conceptions, and the explanations on which they are based, are often times in competition with one another.

#5. The teacher has access to different ways of conceiving what is happening in practice, which can create collisions between different discourses as sources of explanation.

When two or more discourses co-exist, they can provide overlapping explanations for what goes on in the classroom. The teacher thus has access to vying ways of conceiving events in her practice, ways which can be incompatible with one another. In writing about something which happened in her first days in the classroom, one teacher, Andrea, expressed the competing explanations quite clearly:

> [ix] I began my first year of classes last year speaking in Spanish. A"**This is a Spanish class und ve vill speak in Spanish! Von't dis be fun?**" Although not intentional, I scared four students out of the higher level course (seniors who didn't want a tough year). The only comment I got from my advisor[10] was, B"**Good, you didn't want them anyway. They wouldn't have been there to work.**" C**Now I see it differently. I want to create an environment where they will learn, but not by fear.** I subsequently had an enjoyable year with the remaining students who decided to stick with it. Unfortunately though, I think my fear overtook my need to feel in control on that first day.
> [AT: P: 7/7/89]

Here there is a collision among different ways of conceiving one aspect of classroom practice: starting out the year using Spanish, the L2, exclusively. The teacher offers three explanations for her decision:

> **(A)** From her "apprenticeship of observation" as a language student, she takes the fact that the teacher has the authority to decide how to run the classroom. She expresses this explanation in the mock Prussian, authoritarian accent of television sit coms.
>
> **(B)** From the norms of her school setting, she takes an explanation of student behavior in the words of her advisor who is a fellow teacher at the school.

---

10 The "advisor" is a colleague who is working as her mentor as part of the state's alternative certification program; the "advisor" has no role in the in-service program.

(C) From the perspective of the professional discourse of the teacher education program.

I refer to the first two sources of explanation as the 'local language' of the school setting: (A) which expresses the norms of experience, and (B) which expresses the norms of school environment. It is the third explanation, (C), which seems to cause the collision. In this case, the local language explanations, (A) and (B), appear to be subsumed and expanded within the explanation in the new discourse (C).

Such collisions among discourses do not always end with this resolved quality however. Sometimes the collisions remain unsettled and open-ended, as the teacher searches for a sense of direction and purpose among the conflicting views of what she is doing which the discourses express. The resolution of the collision is a matter of alliance and status: by choosing one explanation over another, the teacher is allying herself with the authority of a certain set of perceptions of the classroom world and with those who hold those perceptions. As sociolinguist Gee [1990, 104] observes:

> All uses of language situate the speaker and hearer within social fields of status and solidarity. Outside such fields, language becomes inexplicable; one cannot [use it] without some theory (however tacit) of how status and solidarity work in society.

Thus, for example, when teachers cleave to 'local language' explanations for their practice, they can be seen as maintaining solidarity with their teaching environment.

Within this framework, it is important to make two points about these collisions of explanation. First, they do not entail substituting one conception of teaching with another. The process is not a linear one in which the new discourse of the teacher education program simply replaces the local language explanations. Rather, these various forms of explanation intermingle, compete, and continue to be accessible to the teacher. The Soviet linguist Bakhtin called such coexistence of voices, "heteroglossia." He saw it as a necessary condition of human consciousness, arguing that our sense of who we are is socially derived from the various 'voices' which we experience in our lives [Bakhtin 1981]. Thus such collisions of explanation create for the teacher a varied set of voices about practice.

It is interesting to speculate that this co-existence of alternative and competing conceptions of practice may provide an explanation for how the technique of reflection, used increasingly in teacher education, operates [Pennington 1991]. In this view, when teachers reflect on their teaching, they are calling on new discourse from the professional setting to analyze their previous local language explanations of their practice. Thus they comment in one discourse about another and, in doing so, they assert the status and solidarity of one point of view, usually that of the teacher education community, over the other, usually the local language explanations from experience. This is what Andrea does in the passage [ix] above.

The second point is that collisions in explanations represent re-alignment of thought. They reveal multiple perspectives on the same phenomenon; thus it becomes impossible for the teacher to think about teaching in the same way. She now has available to her, although they may not evident in behavior,[11] alternative ways of thinking which can complicate the ways in which she sees and responds to events in the classroom. This is a crucial point. In the teacher education, we generally adopt a linear view of change, tending to focus on replacing the teacher-learner's old conception of practice with the new perspectives which we present.[12] Thus we generally miss the complexity inherent in adopting various perspectives and creating more complicated conceptions of practice.

The linear-replacement assumption of change is problematic because it does not account for how teachers actually learn teaching. It allows teacher educators, supervisors, administrators and researchers to explain as resistance to change, the fact that teachers do not immediately adopt in practice, the complex behaviors which are proposed. The assumption is also dangerously counterproductive. When teachers are seen as not implementing new forms of practice because they resist them, a general societal view is reenforced, perhaps unwittingly. Teachers are seen as conservative and unwilling to

---

11 See Freeman [1989a, 37-39] for discussion of this point.

12 Wallace [1991] refers to this as the dominant, "applied science model" of teacher education. He details three approaches in all, each of which I would argue implements the linear-replacement assumption in different ways.

adopt new ways of doing things, or worse they become unthinking and incapable of change [Lightfoot 1985; Apple & Jungck 1990; Clarke 1991].

#6 These collisions of explanation can lead to shifts in classroom practice.

As the teacher-learners experience the diversification of explanations through acquiring a new professional discourse, their classroom practice changes. The changes are not always dramatic. They often do not entail massive substitution of one way of doing things for another, but they are changes nonetheless. One teacher in the study talks about how she has relaxed in her teaching to allow more of students' perceptions and work with the material to guide the lesson. In the observational data, her practice is different, although subtly so. From one point of view, she is covering less material; from another she is doing a more complete job with what she does do. As she puts it:

> [x] "I realize what used to make me tense in the classroom-- it was always trying to beat the clock and always feeling like somebody was telling me, **[A]'You have to fit this, this, and this, and this into this lesson.'** <...> It was me that was doing that [to myself], but nobody ever stopped to tell me, 'That's okay. **[B]Maybe if you listen to these kids or watch these kids a little more closely, you'd see that what they're doing is plenty.**' To take the questions they ask more seriously as a guide to where they are with the material."
> [CB: I: 11/14/90]

When the lesson is seen as the exercise of the teacher's conception of teaching, the collision of explanations for what she is doing is evident. The local language explanation (A) does not accomodate the degree of student involvement which her new explanation does (B). The teacher has not replaced the local language way of thinking with her new way; rather the collision has allowed her recognize, and thus address, her previous conception of practice. The collision has altered her conception of what she needs to do in her teaching.

Summary of the argument

When teaching is seen as thoughtful work, a lot which we take for granted in teacher education is called into question and has to be reexamined. It is clear that teaching is more than doing things in the classroom; it has to involve both ways of acting and the thinking which underlies them.(point #1)

The alternative, to portray teaching as a matter of behavior, leads inevitably to its deskilling.[13] When teaching becomes simple delivery, the focus is no longer on the person of the teacher or on the interactional and interpersonal substance of the classroom; it is on how best to implement methodology and curricula. In this view, teachers and classrooms are seen as become impediments to effective practice, and not the central elements in it.

However, in accepting that teaching is as much "an act of mind" [Clarke 1991] as an act of behavior, we realize that teachers' "mental lives" [Walberg 1977] must be accounted for in any view of teaching or the education of teachers. Thus it makes senses that teacher-learners enter formal teacher education with a fund of experience or schema about teaching derived from their "apprenticeship of observation" [Lortie 1975] as students, from their experiences with schools and schooling.(point #2) This 'apprenticeship' equips them with conceptions of what teaching is and how teachers behave which, in turn, furnish de facto explanations of practice-- ways of thinking about and understanding teaching and teachers' roles.(also point #2)

The problem is that most teacher education generally ignores teachers' de facto knowledge of teaching.(point #3) It does not take into account-- for better or worse-- what teacher-learners know and believe about teaching. Therefore teacher education, as it is generally conducted today, is a weak form of intervention in shaping what teachers do in classrooms.(also point #3) It is like slapping on a coat of paint, when the house really needs a structural inspection and quite possibly substantial repairs. So I have argued that we have to rethink the function of teacher education, if we want to become more effective at it. That function, I have suggested, should be to use in Shulman's [1988] phrase "to make the tacit explicit." This means enabling teachers to articulate their conceptions of what they do(point #4) and thus to shape those conceptions.

However, conceptions of teaching are not just talk; they are articulations in action of teachers' ways of thinking. Talking about lessons is

---

13 Apple & Jungck [1990] provide an interesting discussion of this point in a case study of the implementation of a junior-high school, computer-literacy unit.

one form of action; doing lessons is another. It is a mistake, commonly made by teacher educators and researchers, to construe these two forms of action as parallel, or to see the first, talk, as representing the second, doing. Rather they are both articulations of a conception of practice.[14] The issue in teacher education is articulating de facto conceptions of practice in order to examine, analyze, and alter them if need be. This can only be done though the use of an additional discourse which allows the teacher-learner to gain insight and perspective on what seems natural, intuitive, and tacit; to recognize and articulate the status-quo.

In teacher education programs, then, teacher-learners gain access to an additional discourse. They thus have access to multiple ways of conceiving teaching. There is the local language of their experience(point #2) which combines with, and is generally re-enforced by, the ways in which teaching is dealt with in the school settings where the teacher-learners work and do their practica. And there is the discourse of their professional education.(point #5)

Within this analysis, the emphasis in teacher education is shifted from transmitting knowledge and inculcating behavior, to socializing teacher-learners in the modes of thinking and doing of a professional discourse which ultimately furnishes a professional identity, status and authority [Gee 1990]. The discourse can guide their activity by helping them to articulate-- and thus to gain access to changing-- their de facto explanations for classroom practice. While medical and legal education are acknowledged as forms of socialization, the aims of which are to develop a new discourse and way of perceiving and acting on the world [see Freeman & Cazden 1991], we have been slow to recognize this function in the education of teachers.

As teacher-learners gain alternative ways of conceiving teaching and learning through the socially constructed facts of the additional discourse of their professional education, these ways inevitably collide with their de facto explanations and knowledge about teaching derived from experience and context. To put the issue in another way, what teacher-learners encounter in

---

14 See Freeman [1991, Chapter II], for a fuller discussion of this issue from research standpoint.

formal teacher education often does not account for-- because it does not allow for articulation of-- the ways in which they were taught as students and the expectations and demands of their teaching contexts.[15] These collisions are sometimes labeled as the distinction between 'theory' and 'practice,' in which theory represents the professional discourse of the teacher education community while practice represents the teacher-learners' de facto local language explanations from experience. When seen as colliding discourses however, theory and practice are clarified as what they are: different ways of thinking about and articulating the classroom reality. The distinction between them becomes a matter of the relative status and power of one discourse, and its explanations, over the other [see Clarke 1991; also Gee 1990].

Closing

Thus we return to the two premises with which I started the paper. First, we must conceive of teaching as the thought and activity. Second, therefore teacher education has to be more than the shaping of activity; it must entail the construction of teacher-learners' conceptions of their practice. In closing, while it may risk being prescriptive, I will summarize four characteristics which enhance the likelihood that a teacher education program may influence teacher-learners' ways of thinking about what they do in the classroom and thus contribute to constructing their conceptions of practice.[16]

1) The teacher education program [TEP] needs **a unified discourse.** This involves more than talking the same language; it means operating from a explicit view of teaching and learning, from a shared set of socially constructed facts. To do so, the faculty needs to share-- and work to articulate and make explicit-- a coherent approach to instruction, in both philosophy and in practice.

---

15 Richards & Hino [1983] provide documentation of this phenomenon of teachers' perceiving their preparation as not relating to their classroom needs in one national context, Japan.

16 Freeman & Cazden [1991, 240-241] offers an earlier version of these characteristics; Freeman [1991, Chapter IX] presents a theoretical framework for them.

2) Instruction in the TEP should be built on **experience and reflection.** Teacher-learners should be taught as they are expected to teach. They should also be encouraged to examine how the instruction they are receiving embodies what they are learning about teaching. The value here lies not the modelling of classroom teaching per se, but in the fact that the teacher-learners' understanding of the shared discourse develops through their experience with it.

3) The program should involve the teacher-learners in **different contexts of teaching practice**. Some contexts should be sheltered or autotelic, ie. involving limited risk like micro-teaching or guided practica, while others should be fully embedded in world of schooling [see Freeman 1989b]. It is equally important that provision be made for the shared discourse to continue to operate, although not exclusively, in all these settings. Assigning teacher-learners to on-site cooperating teachers or mentors during a practicum is not the same as having that them maintain contact with the shared discourse through direct faculty supervision. The cooperating teacher will uses one discourse, of the school setting, while the program faculty continue to use the discourse into which the teacher-learners are being socialized.

4) Finally, the program should focus on teacher-learners' **constructing their own knowledge of teaching**. As Kennedy [1991, 2] writes in outlining the research agenda for learning teaching:

> Teachers, like other learners, interpret new content through their exisiting understandings and modify abd reinterpret new ideas on the basis of what they already know or believe.

Thus the aim of teacher education programs should not be for teacher-learners to operate off of received knowledge, but to develop their own understandings. Many have argued that models of teacher education which depend on knowledge- transmission, or 'input-output' models of teacher education Stern [1983], are essentially ineffective [Stern 1983; Freeman 1989; Wallace 1991]. In that such models depend on received knowledge to influence behavior, they do not acknowledge that-- much less encourage-- teacher-learners to construct their own versions of teaching.

This current overdependance on knowledge transmission is, in my opinion, the Achilles heel of second language teacher education. It masks the

general ineffectiveness of education efforts behind on-going debates about epistemological, procedural, and political questions such as what constitutes the appropriate knowledge-base of language teaching, what procedures should be used in teacher education, or what will professionalize second language teaching. While such issues have their place, they do not inform the basic challenge in teacher education: how teachers adopt additional ways of conceiving what they do. Knowledge-transmission models, and the programs which implement them, assume that teachers' classroom practice can be directly shaped by other peoples' ideas. Until we realize just how serious and pervasive this fallacy is, and until we challenge it directly in our work with teachers, I do not see how we can make progress in providing effective teacher education. Enabling teachers to construct their knowledge of teaching, both with guidance and independently, is the central work of teacher education.

References

Allwright, R. 1988. *Observation in the Language Classroom.* London: Longman.

Allwright, R. 1984. "Why Don't Learners Learn What Teachers Teach?" In D. Singleton & D. Little (eds.) *Language Learning in Formal and Informal Contexts.* Dublin: IRAAL. 3-18.

Apple, M. & S. Jungck. 1990. "'You don't have to be a teacher to teach this unit:' Teaching, Technology and Gender in the Classroom." American Educational Research Journal, 27. (2). 227-254.

Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Austin TX: University of Texas Press.

Chall, J. 1983. *Stages of Reading Development.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Chaudron, C. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, C. & P. Peterson. 1986. "Teachers' Thought Processes." In M. Wittrock (ed). Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd edition) New York: Macmillan Publishing. 255-297.

Clarke, M. 1991. "On the Dysfunctions of the Theory/ practice Distinction." Paper presented at the annual TESOL Convention; New York NY.

Crow, N. 1986. "The Role of Teacher Education in Teacher Socialization: a Case Study." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Franciso CA.

Dunkin, M. & B. Biddle. 1974. *The Study of Teaching.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Etheridge, C.P. 1988. "Socialization on the Job: How Beginning Teachers Move from University Learnings to School-based Practices." Paper presented at the Mid-south Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Louisville, KY.

Fleck, L. 1935/ 1979. *The Social Construction of Scientific Thought.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freeman, D. & C. Cazden. 1991. "Learning to Talk like a Professional: Some Pragmatics of Foreign Language Teacher Training." In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.) *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph Series: vol 2.* Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois. 225-245.

Freeman, D. 1991. *'The Same Things Done Differently.'* Doctoral dissertation: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Freeman, D. 1990a. *'Thoughtful Work': Reconceptualizing the Research Literature on Teacher Thinking.* Qualifying Paper: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Freeman, D. 1990b. "Intervening in Practice Teaching." In J. Richards & D. Nunan. *Second Language Teacher Education.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 103-117.

Freeman, D. 1990c. *"Inter-Teaching and the Grammar of Experience."* Plenary presented at the TESOL Mid-Summer Meeting. East Lansing, MI.

Freeman, D. 1989a. "Teacher Training, Development, and Decision-making." TESOL Quarterly, 23. (1), 27-47.

Freeman, D. 1989b. "Learning to Teach: Four Instructional Patterns in Language Teacher Education." Prospect: the Journal of the Adult Migrant Education Program [Australia], 4. (2), 31-49.

Gee, J. 1990. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses.* Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Kagan, D. 1988. "Teaching as Clinical Problem-solving: A Critical Examination of the Analogy and its Implications" Review of Educational Research, 58 (4), 482-505.

Kennedy, M. 1991. "An Agenda for Research on Teacher Learning" East Lansing MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Kennedy, M. 1990. "Policy Issues in Teacher Education." East Lansing MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Lightfoot, S.L. 1985. "The Lives of Teachers." In Shulman, L. & G. Sykes (eds). *Handbook of Teaching and Policy.* New York: Longman. 241-261.

Lortie. D. 1975. *Schoolteacher: a Sociological Study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

National Institute of Education [NIE]. 1975. "Teaching as Clinical Problem-solving." *Report of Panel #6; National Conference on Studies in Teaching.* Washington DC: National Institute of Education.

Peirce, B. 1990. "A Reader Responds..." *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(1), 105-112.

Pennington, M. 1991. "Reflecting on Teaching and Learning: A Developmental Focus for the Second Language Classroom." Paper presented at the First International Conference on Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching, Hong Kong.

Richards, J. & D. Nunan. 1990. *Second Language Teacher Education.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards. J. & N. Hino. 1983. "Training ESOL Teacahers: the Need for Needs Assessment". In J. Alatis, H. Stern, & P. Strevens (eds). *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Language teachers: Towards a Rationale.* Washington DC: Georgetown University Press. 312-327.

Shavelson, R. & P. Stern. 1981. "Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Thoughts, Judgements, Decisions, and Behavior." Review of Educational Research, 51 (4), 455-498.

Shulman, L. 1988. "The dangers of dichotomous thinking in education." In P. Grimmet & G. Erickson (eds). *Reflection in Teacher Education.* New York: Teachers College Press. 31-39.

Shulman, L. 1987. "Knowledge-base and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform." Harvard Educational Review, 57. (1) 1-22.

Shulman, L. 1986. "Paradigms and Research Programs in the Study of Teaching" In M. Wittrock (ed) Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd edition) New York: Macmillan Publishing. 3-36.

Stern, H.H. 1983. "Language Teacher Education: An Approach to the Issues and a Framework for Discussion." In J. Alatis, H. Stern, & P. Strevens (eds). *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Language teachers: Towards a Rationale.* Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.342-362.

Stevick, E. 1980. *Teaching Languages: A Way and Ways.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Walberg, H. 1977. "Decision and Perception: New Constructs for Research on Teaching Effects." Cambridge [UK] Journal of Education, 7. (1), 12-20.

Wallace, M. 1991. *Training Foreign Language Teachers: a Reflective Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.